For the Northern District of California

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

| 1 | | |
|----|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | IN THE UNITE | ED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 6 | FOR THE NORTH | ERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | KAREN MOE HUMPHREYS, | No. C-04-03808 SI (EDL) |
| 9 | Plaintiff, | ORDER |
| 10 | v. | |
| 11 | REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF | |
| 12 | CALIFORNIA ET AL, Defendants. | |
| 13 | Defendants. | _/ |

The Court hereby GRANTS Plaintiff's administrative motion for leave to:

1. File a five-page supplement to her Reply ISO Motion to Compel Production of Documents on Privilege Log ("Motion to Compel"). This supplemental pleading will be filed by August 15, 2006, and will be strictly limited to addressing the 35 items in Defendants' August 9, 2006, "Addendum to Revised Privilege Log," and, if added by August 14 at 10:00 a.m., the one additional item referred to below. Defendants wrote Plaintiff on August 9, 2006 that in addition to the addendum to the privilege log provided on that late date, Defendants were "still in the process of determining whether a single document (which we have neither produced nor put on the privileged log) is subject to the attorney-client privilege." Lee Decl., Ex. A For the time being, the Court will defer consideration of whether the additions to the privilege log are too late, but Defendants are cautioned that if they wish to argue that the additional single document that they have not yet logged is privileged, they must provide an addendum to the log to Plaintiff no later than August 14, 2006 at 10 a.m. Defendants may not claim privilege for any additional items on the archive CD referred to in the August 9, 2006 letter, due to waiver by untimeliness.

Case 3:04-cv-03808-SI Document 466 Filed 08/11/06 Page 2 of 2

| | 2. Defendants may file a response to the supplemental pleading no later than August | 18 |
|-------|---|----|
| 2006. | | |

3. The August 22, 2006 hearing is vacated. The Court will notify the parties if it decides that a hearing is necessary at a later date, otherwise it will decide the motion on the papers.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 11, 2006

United States Magistrate Judge